

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated July 7, 1999. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification and claims for various typographical errors, and rejected claims 85-129 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over claims 1-27 of United States Patent No. 5,675,746. The Examiner also rejected claims 85-129 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim what applicants regard as the invention. In support of this rejection, the Examiner asserted that the terms "abstract information", "sports information", "legal information", and "defense information" were "relative" terms which render the claims indefinite.

On October 5, 1999, a telephone interview was conducted between the undersigned attorney, Examiner Kalinowski and Supervisory Examiner Voeltz during which the outstanding rejections were discussed. Applicant greatly appreciates the time and consideration afforded applicant during the interview.

During the interview, the undersigned argued that the term abstract information, which the Examiner acknowledges is defined in the specification as "information about the real world that does not have a physical object equivalent in the world", is clear and definite in the context of the invention as claimed. In this regard, applicant pointed out that the claimed abstract information is displayed "as a multi-dimensional information terrain" including a first and second "categorical" dimension and a "numerical" dimension. In this regard, the abstract information, which is displayed as a "multi-dimensional information terrain" is statistical in nature, and does not have "a physical object equivalent in the real world."

The undersigned also discussed the Examiner's contention that :

speed and inertia are forces that are integral components of the virtual reality simulation of flying an aircraft. They are forces that occur in the real world and have no physical object equivalents. But at the same time Applicant admits that flight simulation is

known in the prior art and is distinct from Applicant's invention. It seems that Applicant's definition of abstract is too vague and broad since it encompasses systems that Applicant admits are well known in the prior art.

In response, applicant agreed that speed and inertia are examples of "abstract information", but pointed out that the display of speed and inertia in prior art flight simulators is not encompassed by the presently pending claims because, in such simulators, speed and inertial are not displayed "as a multi-dimensional information terrain" including a first and second "categorical" dimension and a "numerical" dimension as claimed. Moreover, when the term abstract information is properly interpreted as set forth above, the metes and bounds of abstract sports information, abstract legal information, and abstract defense information are clear and definite.

At the interview, the Examiner requested that the definition of abstract information set forth in the specification be made of record in applicants response to the Office Action. Applicant submits that this response complies with the Examiner's request, and, in view thereof, withdrawal of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

The Examiner also stated that although the terms sports information, legal information, and defense information are clearly supported in the specification, that as 35 CFR 1.84 requires that each limitation of the claim be illustrated in the drawings, additional drawings should be added to the present application, with corresponding amendments to the specification to refer thereto. In response to the Examiner's request, applicants have submitted herewith three sheets of new drawings containing Figures 12, 13, and 14, and have amended the specification accordingly. Support for these amendments can be found in Figure 3 as originally filed, and in the specification at pages 6, 7, 27, and 28. No new matter has been added.

In response to the Examiner's objections to the claims and specification, applicant has amended the specification and claims in order to correct the typographical errors identified by the Examiner. In order to expedite prosecution of this case, applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer over United States Patent Nos. 5,675,746 and 5,774,878 in response to the Examiner's obviousness type double patenting rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 

Cary S. Kappel, Reg. No. 36,561
1140 Avenue of the Americas, 15th Floor
New York, New York 10036
(212) 997-1028 X 226